

1 CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
2 HOWARD D. RUSSELL, Deputy City Attorney
3 State Bar No. 163595

4 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
5 Long Beach, California 90802-4664
6 Telephone: (562) 570-2200
7 Facsimile: (562) 436-1579

8 Email: howard.russell@longbeach.gov

9
10 Attorneys for Defendants
11 JULIE LACEY (ACKERMAN)
12 TOMAS DIAZ
13 HARRISON MOORE
14 ALEJANDRO CAZARES

15
16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 RAY WEBB,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 OFFICER J. ACKERMAN, OFFICER A.
22 CAZAREZ, OFFICER T. DIAZ,
23 OFFICER H. MOORE,

24 Defendants.

25 Case No.: CV13-09112 PLA

26 Honorable Paul L. Abrams, Magistrate
27 Courtroom G, 9th Floor, 312 North
28 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

29
30 **DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO**
31 **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE**
32 **NUMBER ONE TO EXCLUDE**
33 **EVIDENCE OF PLAINTIFF'S**
34 **CRIMINAL HISTORY**

35 Hearing date: February 15, 2017
36 Hearing time: 9:30 a.m.

37 I.

38 **INTRODUCTION**

39 On October 30, 2011, the defendant officers encountered plaintiff during and
40 following a traffic stop. Officers found cocaine during a search of plaintiff's vehicle

1 and force was used during the encounter. Plaintiff was arrested and taken into
2 custody.

3 That date was not the first, or last, time that plaintiff has been in police
4 custody.

5 **II.**

6 **ARGUMENT**

7 **A. A WITNESS MAY BE IMPEACHED BY EVIDENCE OF**
8 **CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS**

9 Once a witness testifies, their character for truthfulness is at issue, and they
10 may be impeached. FRE 607.

11 A witness may specifically be impeached by evidence of certain criminal
12 convictions. FRE 609.

13 If plaintiff has convictions that fall within FRE 609, defendants should be
14 allowed to offer that evidence.

15
16 **B. THE EVIDENCE IS RELEVANT AND ADMISSIBLE UNDER**
F.R.E. 402 AND THE PROBATIVE VALUE OUTWEIGHS ANY DANGER
17 **OF UNFAIR PREJUDICE**

18 The evidence of convictions, or even arrests, is also relevant and the probative
19 value is not substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice under FRE
20 403.

21 Plaintiff may try to persuade the jury that the cocaine in the vehicle was not
22 his; the jury should be able to consider plaintiff's numerous narcotics-related arrests
23 in assessing plaintiff's credibility.

24 Moreover, if the jury erroneously believes that plaintiff had never previously
25 been subject to police authority, the jury may award more substantial damages than

1 if the jury realizes that plaintiff had "experience" with the police.

2 And, any risk of "unfair" prejudice can be mitigated by the Court giving a
3 limiting instruction.

4 **III.**

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 Based on the above, defendants respectfully request the Court to deny the
7 motion in limine.

8 ///

9 DATED: December 30, 2016

10 CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney

11
12 By: /s/ HOWARD D. RUSSELL
13 HOWARD D. RUSSELL
14 Deputy City Attorney
15 Attorneys for Defendants
16 CITY OF LONG BEACH, et al.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28